

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-9 and 12-16 remain pending in the application. By this amendment, claims 1 and 13 are amended. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1-9 and 12-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goring (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2002/0077892) in view of Okamoto (U.S. Pat. No. 4,985,850) and further in view of Ito (U.S. Pat. No. 4,584,573). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Notwithstanding, Applicant elects to amend claims 1 and 13.

Claim 1 calls for a method of controlling a printing apparatus having stored therein in advance predetermined image data corresponding to payment transaction print data generated based on input information concerning merchandise sales. The printing apparatus is arranged to print the predetermined image data on a receipt by adding the image data upon receiving the payment transaction print data by the printing apparatus. The method includes the steps of: obtaining the payment transaction print data; retrieving a predetermined character string indicative of a print position of the image data to be printed on the receipt from the payment transaction print data; obtaining a line number specified by the retrieved predetermined character string; adding the image data to the payment transaction print data based on the obtained line number so as to print the image data with a position on the receipt specified by the line number serving as a reference to obtain a synthesized print result; and printing the

image data so that a plurality of images are superposed on the payment transaction print data by dividing the receipt into segments.

Claim 13 calls for a printing apparatus which stores therein in advance predetermined image data corresponding to payment transaction print data generated by a host computer based on input information concerning merchandise sales. The printing apparatus is arranged to print the predetermined image data on a receipt upon receiving the payment transaction print data by the printing apparatus. The printing apparatus includes: means for storing the image data; means for obtaining the payment transaction print data from the host computer; means for obtaining from the host computer an image addition setting command for printing with the image data being added; means for analyzing the image addition setting command to thereby obtain a line number indicative of a print position of the image data on the receipt; means for generating receipt print data by adding the image data to the payment transaction print data based on the line number; and means for printing the image data so that a plurality of images are superposed on the payment transaction print data by dividing the receipt into segments.

Thus, both claims 1 and 13 recite that a plurality of images are superposed on the payment transaction print data by dividing the receipt into segments. Support for this subject matter can be found at least at paragraph [0011] of Applicant's specification as originally filed. Accordingly, no new matter is added.

In contrast to the claimed arrangement and as acknowledge in the last office action, Goring and Okamoto do not disclose printing the image data so that the image data is superposed on the payment transaction print data. Instead, the office action

relies on Ito for teaching printing image data so that the image data is superposed on the print data. However, Ito fails to teach or suggest printing a plurality of images superposed on the payment transaction print data by dividing the receipt into segments. Since the claimed invention can print a plurality of images superposed on the payment transaction print data by dividing the receipt into segments, it has the advantage of printing various types of receipts. Neither Ito nor the combination of Ito, Goring and Okamoto can achieve this advantage. Thus, even if Ito is combined with Goring and Okamoto, the combination does not yield the claimed invention. As such, the prior art cannot render claims 1 or 13 obvious and therefore claims 1 and 13 should be in condition for allowance.

Inasmuch as claims 2-9 and 12 depend from claim 1, claims 2-9 and 12 should be in condition for allowance. Similarly, inasmuch as claims 14-16 depend from claim 13, claims 14-16 should also be in condition for allowance.

## **CONCLUSION**

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 7, 2008

By: /G. Gregory Schivley/  
G. Gregory Schivley  
Reg. No. 27,382  
Bryant E. Wade  
Reg. No. 40,344

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1600

[GGS/BEW/pvd]